



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/726,766	11/29/2000	John M. Davidson	020533.0340	1919
7590	04/08/2005		EXAMINER	
Baker Botts L.L.P. 2001 Ross Avenue Dallas, TX 75201-2980			LEE, PHILIP C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/726,766	Applicant(s) DAVIDSON ET AL.	
	Examiner Philip C Lee	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-24,26-33 and 35-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-24,26-33 and 35-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2154

1. This action is responsive to the amendment and remarks filed on December 10, 2004.
2. Claims 1, 3-24, 26-33 and 35-45 are presented for examination.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. code not included in this office action can be found in a prior office action.

Double Patenting Rejection

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).
5. A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).
6. Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1, 12, 19 and 33 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 30 of copending Application No. 09/727,313. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because: other than the phrases "an identifier of a second

client” and “identify and remove the network address request header”, the scope of the invention are not patentably distinct.

7. It would have been obvious to those skilled in the art that a packet contains header information such as destination address of the client (e.g. second client). More specifically, claim 1 of copending Application No. 09/727,313 recited “an identifier for identifying a destination client”. As per the phrase “identify and remove the network address request header”, claim 30 of copending Application No. 09/727,313 recited “to process at least a portion of the first point-to-point signal to identify a control channel address associated with a destination client”. It would have been obvious to those skilled in the art that in order to identify a control channel address in a packet, a header of the packet must be removed.

Claim 24 is provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 30 of copending Application No. 09/727,313. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because: other than the additional phrases “ comprising a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol DISCOVER header or a Bootstrap protocol REQUEST header” and “wherein the first client is operable to communicate the encapsulated signal toward the router for forwarding to the tunneling server without reference to the routing table, the scope of the invention are not patentably distinct.

It would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to include a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol DISCOVER as a network address request header. Furthermore, claim 2 of copending Application 09/727,313 recites wherein the network address request header

comprises a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol DISCOVER header. As per the additional phrase “wherein the first client is operable to communicate the encapsulated signal toward the router for forwarding to the tunneling server without reference to the routing table”, it would have been obvious to those skilled in the art to include a router to communicate between the client and the server. More specifically, it is inherent that referencing to the routing table will not be necessary because the packet is a DHCP DISCOVERY packet.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 112

3. Claims 1, 3-24, 26-33 and 35-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. Claim language in the following claims is not clearly understood:
 - i. As per claim 1, line 3, it is unclear if a point-to-point “signal” is a packet or a message; Lines 3-4, it is unclear if a network address request header is a address request header such as a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol or a header with the destination of a address request server; Line 6, it is uncertain if “a

header” is the same header as the network address request header in lines 3-4 [i.e. if they are different, then is the network address request header encapsulated on top of the point-to-point header?].

- ii. As per claim 12, it has the same uncertainties as in claim 1 above.
- iii. As per claim 19, line 4, it has the same uncertainty as in claim 1, line 3 above; Lines 5-6, it has the same uncertainty as in claim 1, lines 3-4 above.
- iv. As per claim 24, line 4, it has the same uncertainty as claim 1, line 3 above.
- v. As per claim 33, line 4, it has the same uncertainty as claim 1, line 3 above; Lines 7-8, it has the same uncertainty as in claim 1, lines 3-4 above.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2154

9. Claims 1, 3, 12-13, 19-20, 24, 33 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over May, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0030977 (hereinafter May) in view of Shukla, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0042875 (hereinafter Shukla) and Araujo et al, U.S. Patent 6,301,229 (hereinafter Araujo).

10. Araujo was cited in the last office action.

11. As per claims 1 and 12, May taught the invention substantially as claimed for communicating with an element within an enterprise network, comprising:

at a first client, converting a first point-to-point protocol signal (e.g. PPP packet) into a network address request protocol packet (e.g. DHCP) (page 4, paragraph 49), the first point-to-point protocol signal comprising a header that includes an identifier of a second client (inherently comprised in the PPP packet).

12. May did not specifically detailing the packet conversion between the point-to-point layer and the network address protocol layer comprises encapsulating the point-to-point signal (e.g. PPP packet) within a network address request header. Shukla taught that the packet conversion between protocol layers comprises each protocol layer encapsulating its own header before transmitting to the next layer (page 1, paragraph 3).

13. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May and Shukla because Shukla's teaching of each

protocol layer encapsulating its own header before transmitting to the next layer would ensure the compatibility of May's system by allowing each layer to package a signal according to the various protocols recommended by the Open System Interconnect (OSI) for network communication.

14. May and Shukla did not teach communicating the encapsulated signal toward a tunneling server. Araujo taught a similar system comprising:

communicating the encapsulated signal toward a tunneling server (col. 9, lines 34-36; col. 6, lines 1-3, 32-38).

15. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May, Shukla and Araujo because Araujo's method of communicating the encapsulated signal toward a tunneling server would improve the management of data flow in May's and Shukla's systems by allowing transmission in a communication channel according to the tunneling protocol (col. 2, lines 45-52).

16. As per claim 19, May taught the invention substantially as claimed, the method comprising:

at a first client, generating point-to-point protocol signal (page 4, paragraph 49); and converting the point-to-point protocol signal (e.g. PPP packet) into a network address request protocol packet (e.g. DHCP) (page 4, paragraph 49).

Art Unit: 2154

17. May did not specifically detailing the packet conversion between the point-to-point layer and the network address protocol layer comprises encapsulating the point-to-point signal (e.g. PPP packet) within a network address request header. Shukla taught that the packet conversion between protocol layers comprises each protocol layer encapsulating its own header before transmitting to the next layer (page 1, paragraph 3).

18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May and Shukla because Shukla's teaching of each protocol layer encapsulating its own header before transmitting to the next layer would ensure the compatibility of May's system by allowing each layer to package a signal according to the various protocol recommended by the Open System Interconnect (OSI) for network communication.

19. May and Shukla did not teach communicating the encapsulated signal toward a tunneling server. Araujo taught a similar system for tunneling in an enterprise network comprising a plurality of clients coupled to a tunneling server (col. 8, lines 66-col. 9, lines 8) by at least one router (col. 7, lines 17-31), the system comprising:

communicating the encapsulated signal toward a tunneling server (col. 9, lines 34-36; col. 6, lines 1-3, 32-38) operable to identify and remove the protocol header (col. 13, lines 37-47), to encapsulate the point-to-point protocol signal within a protocol response header,

Art Unit: 2154

and to communicate the encapsulated response signal toward a second client (col. 13, lines 34-36, 48-56).

20. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May, Shukla and Araujo because Araujo's method of communicating the encapsulated signal toward a tunneling server would improve the management of data flow in May's and Shukla's systems by allowing transmission in a communication channel according to the tunneling protocol (col. 2, lines 45-52).

21. As per claims 24 and 37, May taught the invention substantially as claimed comprising: a protocol stack operable to generate a first point-to-point protocol signal (page 4, paragraph 49) comprising a header that includes an identifier of a second client (inherently comprised in the PPP packet); a module operable to convert the first point-to-point encapsulated signal (e.g. PPP packet that inherently comprised a PPP header) into a network address request protocol packet comprising a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (page 4, paragraph 49) (It is inherent that DHCP comprised of DHCP DISCOVERY); and forwarding the network address request to the tunneling server without reference to the routing table. (It is inherent that referencing to the routing table will not be necessary because the packet is a DHCP DISCOVERY packet).

22. May did not specifically detailing the packet conversion between the point-to-point layer and the network address protocol layer comprises encapsulating the point-to-point signal (e.g. PPP packet) within a network address request header. Shukla taught that the packet conversion between protocol layers comprises each protocol layer encapsulating its own header before transmitting to the next layer (page 1, paragraph 3).

23. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May and Shukla because Shukla's teaching of each protocol layer encapsulating its own header before transmitting to the next layer would ensure the compatibility of May's system by allowing each layer to package a signal according to the various protocol recommended by the Open System Interconnect (OSI) for network communication.

24. May and Shukla did not teach communicating the encapsulated signal toward a tunneling server. Araujo taught a similar system comprising at least one client coupled to a tunneling server by a router having a routing table indexed by data channel addresses (fig. 1) wherein the first client is operable to communicate the protocol request encapsulated signal toward the router for forwarding to the tunneling server (col. 9, lines 34-36; col. 6, lines 1-3, 32-38).

25. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May, Shukla and Araujo because Araujo's method of

communicating the encapsulated signal toward a tunneling server would improve the management of data flow in May's and Shukla's systems by allowing transmission in a communication channel according to the tunneling protocol (col. 2, lines 45-52).

26. As per claim 33, May taught the invention substantially as claimed comprising:
a module operable to receive a first point-to-point protocol signal converted within a network address protocol (page 4, paragraph 49), the first point-to-point protocol signal comprising a header includes an identifier of the client (inherently comprised in the PPP packet), the network address response (It is inherent that DHCP comprised of DHCP OFFER).

27. May did not specifically detailing the packet conversion between the point-to-point layer and the network address protocol layer comprises encapsulating the point-to-point signal (e.g. PPP packet) within a network address request header. Shukla taught that the packet conversion between protocol layers comprises each protocol layer encapsulating its own header before transmitting to the next layer (page 1, paragraph 3).

28. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May and Shukla because Shukla's teaching of each protocol layer encapsulating its own header before transmitting to the next layer would ensure the compatibility of May's system by allowing each layer to package a signal according to the

various protocol recommended by the Open System Interconnect (OSI) for network communication.

29. May and Shukla did not teach removing the protocol response header and a private protocol stack. Araujo taught a similar system wherein a client (element 10, fig. 1) having an enterprise protocol stack operable to process signals received from a data channel and associated with a data channel address (col. 3, lines 11-24), comprising

a tunneling module to removes the protocol response header to expose the first point-to-point protocol signal (col. 3, lines 21-26); and

a private protocol stack operable to receive the first point-to-point protocol signal from the tunneling module and to communicate at least a portion of a payload of the first point-to-point protocol signal to a socket layer coupled to an application residing at the client (col. 3, lines 21-26, 40-43; col. 4, lines 41-46).

30. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May, Shukla and Araujo because Araujo's method of removing the protocol response header would improve the management of data flow of May's and Shukla's systems by allowing the packet to be decapsulated according to the Open System Interconnect (OSI) before forwarding to higher layer processing (col. 4, lines 41-46).

31. As per claims 3, 13 and 20, May, Shukla and Araujo taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 12 and 19 above. Araujo further taught wherein communicating the

Art Unit: 2154

encapsulated signal toward a tunneling server comprises communicating the signal toward a router configured to relay network address requests to the tunneling server (col. 7, lines 17-31) without referencing a routing table indexed by data channel addresses (see May, page 3, paragraph 46; page 4, paragraph 49) (it is inherent that referencing to the routing table will not be necessary because the packet is a DHCP DISCOVERY packet).

32. Claims 4, 10-11, 14, 18, 21, 23, 28-29, 31-32, 38 and 41-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over May, Shukla, and Araujo in view of Inoue et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0007414 (hereinafter Inoue).

33. Inoue was cited in the last office action.

34. As per claims 4, 14, 21, 28-29 and 41-45, May, Shukla and Araujo taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 3, 12-13, 20, 24 and 33 above. May, Shukla and Araujo did not teach a control channel address being different from channel address recognized by the router. Inoue taught wherein the identifier comprises a control channel address of the second client, the control channel address being different from any data channel address recognized by the router (page 7, paragraph 84).

35. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May, Shukla, Araujo and Inoue because Inoue's teaching of a control channel address being different from channel address recognized by the router would

Art Unit: 2154

increase the routing functionality of May's, Shukla's and Araujo's systems by allowing a router to relay packet based on the protocol field of the packet even if the control channel address is unrecognized by the router (page 7, paragraph 84).

36. As per claims 10, 18, 23 and 31, May, Shukla and Araujo taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1, 12, 19 and 24 above. May, Shukla and Araujo did not teach receiving from the tunneling server, the encapsulated response signal with a second point-to-point signal and encapsulated within a network address response header. Inoue taught comprising receiving an encapsulated response signal from the tunneling server, the encapsulated response signal comprising a second point-to-point protocol signal responsive to the first point-to-point protocol signal and encapsulated within a network address response header (page 7, paragraph 96).

37. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May, Shukla, Araujo and Inoue because Inoue's teaching of receiving the encapsulated response signal from the tunneling server would improve the management of data flow in May's and Shukla's systems by allowing transmission in a communication channel according to the tunneling protocol (col. 2, lines 45-52).

38. As per claims 11 and 32, May, Shukla, Araujo and Inoue taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 10 and 31 above. Inoue further taught wherein the network

Art Unit: 2154

address response header comprises a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol OFFER header or a Bootstrap Protocol RESPONSE header (page 7, paragraphs 82 and 96).

39. As per claim 38, May, Shukla and Araujo taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 37 above. May, Shukla and Araujo did not specifically teach a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol DISCOVER header. Inoue taught wherein the network address request header comprises a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol DISCOVER header or a Bootstrap Protocol REQUEST header (page 7, paragraphs 82 and 96).

40. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May, Shukla, Araujo and Inoue because Inoue's teaching of encapsulating a dynamic host configuration protocol request would increase the alertness of May's, Shukla's and Araujo's systems by providing the recognition that the IP address is to be acquired by the DHCP on behalf of the client (page 7, paragraph 84).

41. Claims 5-7, 15-16, 30 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over May, Shukla and Araujo in view of Singhal et al, U.S. Patent 6,633,761 (hereinafter Singhal).

42. Singhal was cited in the last office action.

Art Unit: 2154

43. As per claims 5 and 15, May, Shukla and Araujo taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 12 above. May, Shukla and Araujo did not teach a payload with information to be applied to an application at the second client. Singhal taught wherein the first point-to-point protocol signal comprises a payload including information to be applied to an application residing at a second client (col. 9, lines 60-62).

44. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May, Shukla, Araujo and Singhal because Singhal's system of a payload with information to be applied to an application residing at a second client would increase the flexibility of May's, Shukla's and Araujo's systems by allowing an administrator to remotely transfer information to a client over the network.

45. As per claims 6, 30 and 35, Singhal further taught wherein the application residing at the second client comprises a maintenance application operable to diagnose operational characteristics of the second client (col. 14, lines 3-6).

46. As per claims 7 and 16, May, Shukla and Araujo taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 1 and 12 above. May, Shukla and Araujo did not teach a payload with at least a portion of an application to be installed on the second client. Singhal taught wherein the first point-to-point protocol signal comprises a payload including at least a portion of an application to be installed on the second client (col. 9, lines 60-62).

Art Unit: 2154

47. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May, Shukla, Araujo and Singhal because Singhal's system of a payload with information to be applied to an application residing at a second client would increase the flexibility of May's, Shukla's and Araujo's systems by allowing an administrator to remotely transfer information to a client over the network.

48. As per claim 36, May, Shukla and Araujo taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 33 above. May, Shukla and Araujo did not teach an application to process the at least a portion of the payload and to generate an output. Singhal taught wherein the application comprises an application operable to process the at least a portion of the payload and to generate an output to be communicated toward another network element (col. 9, lines 60-62; col. 14, lines 1-12).

49. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May, Shukla, Araujo and Singhal because Singhal's system of process the at least a portion of the payload and to generate an output would increase the efficiency of May's, Shukla's and Araujo's systems by providing automatic information updates to registry of different devices.

50. Claims 8-9, 17, 22, 26-27 and 39-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over May, Shukla and Araujo in view of Zhang, U.S. Patent 6,108,345 (hereinafter Zhang).

51. Zhang was cited in the last office action.

52. As per claims 8, 17, 22, 26 and 39, Although, May, Shukla and Araujo taught encapsulating the first point-to-point protocol signal within a MAC header with MAC identifier prior to encapsulating the first point-to-point protocol signal within the network request header (see May, page 3, paragraph 47; page 4, paragraph 52), however, May, Shukla and Araujo did not specifically detailing the header encapsulated prior to the DHCP header is a tunneling header. Zhang taught a tunneling header comprising a header with a MAC identifier (col. 10, lines 16-23).

53. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of May, Shukla, Araujo and Zhang because Zhang's teaching of encapsulated tunneling header would increase the efficiency of May's, Shukla's and Araujo's systems by allowing the process of address determination to be included in a packet in a point-to-point tunnel session.

54. As per claims 9, 27 and 40, May, Shukla, Araujo and Zhang taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims 8, 26 and 39 above. Araujo further taught wherein the tunneling header comprises a tunneling header selected from the group consisting of a Layer Two Tunneling Protocol (L2TP) header, a Point-to-Point Tunneling Protocol (PPTP), or a Layer Two Forwarding (L2F) header (col. 5, lines 1-4; col. 9, lines 4-15).

55. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-24, 26-33 and 35-45, filed 12/10/04, have been fully considered but are not deemed to be persuasive and are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

CONCLUSION

56. A shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip C Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-3967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM TO 5:30 PM Monday to Thursday and every other Friday. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100